

Application Serial No.: 09/731,640
Attorney Docket No.: 0190144

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the *Final* Office Action of June 10, 2005, where the Examiner has rejected claims 1-22. By the present amendment, claims 1-4, 15 and 17-20 have been amended, and claims 5-14 and 21-22 have been cancelled. After the present amendment, claims 1-4 and 15-20 are pending in the present application. Allowance of outstanding claims 1-4 and 15-20 in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 21 and 22 under 35 USC §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 21 and 22, under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Kostrzewski, et al. (SPIE) ("Kostrzewski").

By the present amendment, applicant has cancelled claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 21 and 22 has been rendered moot.

B. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 7 and 8, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Artigalas (USPN 5,181,102) ("Artigalas") in view of Penney (USPN 5,515,112) ("Penney").

By the present amendment, applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "a first imager configured to capture an image of an object in a spatial domain and generate first spatial-

Application Serial No.: 09/731,640

Attorney Docket No.: 0190144

domain image data, wherein the object is illuminated by an incoherent light source; a spatial light modulator configured to receive the first spatial-domain image data and a beam of coherent light, and generate diffracted light rays; a transform lens configured to transform the diffracted light rays into a diffraction pattern; a second imager having an array of photocells, wherein the second imager is configured to capture the diffraction pattern in a spatial frequency domain and generate spatial frequency-domain image data; and an image processor that receives the spatial frequency-domain image data from the second imager and transforms the spatial frequency-domain image data into a second spatial-domain image data.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest a first imager that captures an image of an object in a spatial domain and generates first spatial-domain image data, wherein the object is illuminated by an incoherent light source, and a second imager that captures a diffraction pattern in a spatial frequency domain from a transform lens receiving diffracted light rays from a spatial light modulator that receives the first spatial-domain image data and a beam of coherent light. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, and its dependent claims 2-4 should be allowed.

By the present amendment, applicant has cancelled claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 7 and 8 has been rendered moot.

Application Serial No.: 09/731,640

Attorney Docket No.: 0190144

C. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Artigalas in view of Penney, and further in view of Kostrzewski.

By the present amendment, applicant has cancelled claims 5 and 6. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 5 and 6 has been rendered moot.

D. Rejection of Claims 9-15 and 17-20 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-15 and 17-20, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Artigalas in view of Penney, and further in view of Fowler, et al. (USPN 5,461,425) ("Fowler").

By the present amendment, applicant has amended independent method claim 15 to include limitations similar to those of claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 15, as amended, and its dependent claims 17-20, should be allowed at least for the same reasons stated above in conjunction with patentability of claim 1, as amended.

By the present amendment, applicant has cancelled claims 9-14. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of claims 9-14 has been rendered moot.

Application Serial No.: 09/731,640
Attorney Docket No.: 0190144

E. Rejection of Claim 16 under 35 USC §103(a)


The Examiner has rejected claim 16, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Artigalas in view of Penney, and further in view of Fowler and Nagumo (USPN 4,189,751) ("Nagumo").

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 depends from claim 15. Accordingly, claim 16 should be allowed at least for the same reasons stated above in conjunction with patentability of claim 15, as amended..

F. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing reasons, an early Notice of Allowance directed to all claims 1-4 and 15-20 pending in the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP



Farshad Farjami, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,014

FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP
26522 La Alameda Ave., Suite 360
Mission Viejo, California 92691
Telephone: (949) 282-1000
Facsimile: (949) 282-1002

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed by facsimile transmission to United States Patent and Trademark Office at facsimile number (571) 273-8300, on the date stated below.

8/10/05

Date

Christina Carter

Name

Christina Carter

Signature